

We are trying to move to some kind of financially sound lockbox. In 2014, Social Security begins to run in a deficit. Social Security started about 60 years ago, I think—in the 1930s. People paid 1 percent of \$3,000—\$30—into Social Security. There were 31 people working for every beneficiary. Of course, now that has changed. Now we all pay 12.5 percent of our earnings up to \$70,000 or more, moving up. There are, I think, fewer than three people working for each one drawing benefits. In the near future, it will be fewer than two. That is the sort of dilemma with which we are faced.

I suppose there are many considerations to look at, but there are three that are obvious.

One, you could reduce benefits. Not many are prepared to do that; even though Social Security, of course, is not a retirement program, it is a supplementary program. For a high percentage of people, that is, indeed, their largest income requirement.

Two, you could increase taxes. I don't think there is a great deal of excitement about that. I do not think it is a great idea. Social Security taxes are the largest tax that most Americans pay.

Three, increase the rate of return on the money that is in the trust fund. That is one of the things we are talking about doing, trying to put together a personal account—not to take all of the 12 percent but to take, say, 3 or 4 percent out of the 12, about a third of the money. Let it be your account, your personal account. If, unfortunately, you were not able to live long enough to get all of your money out of it, it would go to your estate.

How is it invested? By private investors, similar to the Federal savings program. Once a year, members get a sheet of paper asking how they would like this invested. The choice would be in equities, bonds, or in a combination of the two. So members would choose one of those options. It is invested for you—not invested, as the President has suggested, where he takes trillions of dollars and has the Government invest it. Then the Government would basically control the marketplace. None of us want that.

Personal ownership, it seems to me, ensures that the Federal Government can't come back later and reduce your benefits. That is a way to secure those dollars. They are not then in the Government ready to be spent for some other reason.

Depending on your view about the size of government—and there is a legitimate difference between those who are more conservative and those who are more liberal. There are always ways to spend more money. To control the size of government, as has been our goal over the last number of years, you can't have a lot of surplus money lying around or else it is simply spent and

government grows. We have to do something to secure Social Security. Then, hopefully, when there is excess money, we can look for some kind of tax relief.

It has been a long time since we started on this. Quite frankly, I think the sooner we make a change, the less abrupt that change will have to be. I am hopeful we do get back. We started out this year wanting to do this. Now the President is reluctant to take any leadership. Some of the leaders in the Congress were saying we ought to set it aside. I don't agree.

Certainly, we need to focus on Kosovo, but it doesn't mean we don't do the other things that are before the Senate. It is time to design a first-class system that fulfills the needs of everyone—our older citizens, our younger citizens. We need a permanent fix, not just tinkering around the edges. People have thought for years that Social Security was the holy grail of politics—touch it and you are dead. I think it has changed, because people understand if it is not changed, Social Security will be dead.

I hope we move forward.

#### SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to recall a towering public servant, Senator Roman L. Hruska, who spent 22 years of his life in this body and who died yesterday at Omaha, NE, at the age of 94. Senator Hruska served with my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

In a day when some might question the morality of public service, the civility of public service, the genuineness of public service, and the goodness of public service, they did not know Senator Roman Hruska. Senator Hruska was one of 11 children, born in David City, NE, 94 years ago. His father had emigrated from Czechoslovakia, and moved his family to Omaha where he felt they would have a better opportunity to get an education and a better opportunity for a better life.

Senator Hruska's father was a teacher. Senator Hruska went on through public schools in Nebraska, attended a number of graduate schools, the University of Chicago, and obtained his law degree in Nebraska. He started a law practice in south Omaha.

When there became a vacancy on the Douglas County board of commissioners in Omaha, NE, his fellow citizens came to him and said, "Will you serve for one term?" That one term began in 1944.

A year later, he became chairman of the Douglas County board of commissioners, and until 1952 he served the Greater Omaha area and the State of Nebraska with great distinction.

In 1952, a House seat opened up. It was the seat of Howard Buffett. Mr.

President, that name "Buffett" may ring a bell. Howard Buffett was the father of Warren Buffett. Howard Buffett decided not to run for reelection.

Again, Roman Hruska's friends and colleagues said, "Will you run for Congress?" Roman Hruska said, "Well, I will do that for a short period of time." Roman Hruska was overwhelmingly elected to the Congress in 1952. Two years later, the Senate seat opened and, again, the same people asked Roman Hruska to serve. He ran for the Senate in 1954 and never looked back. He retired from the Senate in 1976.

I recall my first exposure to Senator Hruska as a young chief of staff to Congressman John Y. McCollister in the early 1970s. I would come to the Senate once or twice a week to get a delegation letter signed by Senator Hruska and then Senator Curtis. Senator Hruska would see me occasionally standing outside a hearing room and would never fail to accord me not only some recognition, which as we know around here does not always happen with junior staffers, but he was beyond gracious. He always had time for young people, always had time to talk a little bit about what we thought and what was on our minds.

I really came to cherish those times when I had an opportunity to come over and see Senator Hruska. Senator Hruska was often in meetings, I say to Senator HOLLINGS, with some of Senator HOLLINGS' favorite colleagues, such as Senator Goldwater, Senator Eastland, Senator Long.

As a young staffer, I would be invited in to the outer ring of those distinguished United States Senators and would stand and watch and listen. Senator Hruska would never fail to introduce me to his colleagues and make me feel not only welcome but a part of Government, a part of what he was doing.

The dignity that Senator Hruska brought to his service is something well remembered by not just those of us who were privileged to have some relationship but all who served with Senator Hruska. He made this body a better body. He made America stronger. He believed in things.

Senator Hruska did not believe in governance by way of calibration of the polls. You knew where Senator Hruska was and why. He was always a gentleman—always a gentleman. He would debate the issues straight up. He won most of the time; he lost his share. But the relationships that Senator Hruska developed and the respect that underpinned his service is rather uncommon. We are all better for it. America is stronger for it. Nebraska loses a very wise counselor. America loses a great public servant.

When I ran for the Senate in 1996, one of the first people I went to see was Senator Hruska. The advice he gave me was consistent with his service and his

life. He said, "Chuck, I would not feel competent to judge or give you counsel on the issues of our day, but I will tell you this: Play it straight, say it straight, respect your colleagues and respect yourself, but most important, respect the institution of the U.S. Congress and always understand the high privilege it is to be part of that great body."

He was much too modest to go beyond what he gave me as good, solid advice on issues, but I can tell you that on the big issues over the last 3 years, not only I, but many of my colleagues, have constantly gone back to Roman Hruska and asked for his judgment and his thoughts.

He will be greatly missed. I say to Senator HOLLINGS, I will leave these remarks on behalf of your former colleague and friend and my friend, Senator Roman Hruska, by referring to Senator Hruska the way your former colleague, Everett Dirksen, once referred to Roman Hruska, and that is: A salute to the noblest Roman of them all—Roman Hruska.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, reminds me of a happier day. I say a happier day most sincerely in the sense that we had not become subject to all the consultants, all the pollsters to the point whereby today, in large measure, we more or less are marionettes to the consultants' hot-button items and issues and not the needs of the people.

There was a tremendous respect on both sides of the aisle. I was elected in 1966. At that time, Senator Hruska was the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and Senator Jim Eastland of Mississippi served as chairman. I remember the various measures that went before the Judiciary Committee for debate and action were those bills that were agreed upon by Senator Hruska and Senator Eastland.

Senator Hruska was a profound lawyer, and I say that advisedly in the sense of a little quibble. Everybody will remember or the media friends will remember when we were trying to nominate a Supreme Court Justice, that maybe he was not a graduate of Harvard and, therefore, sort of what they would call "mediocre talent." That nettled the Senator from Nebraska and he said, "Well, there are a lot of people in the land and a lot of lawyers of mediocre talent and maybe they need representation on the Court."

I remember him as a very erudite counsel who worked on these measures seriously and with purpose and was most respected. He has been a loss, I say to Senator HAGEL. He has been missed over the many years because he held the line. We deliberated in a bipartisan fashion, and he contributed to that bipartisan leadership which is so lacking today.

We ought to be working together. It would be a happier day. But, unfortunately, here we go again. The downtown crowd thinks they can embellish a computer glitch problem into a reform of the State tort laws with respect to joint and several liability, punitive damages, and everything else. As a result, it is a nonstarter.

Like last week, the folks thought it would be good, since the President said, "I'm going to save 62 percent for Social Security," they one-upmanned and said, "We'll save 100 percent," knowing all along the 100 percent going to pay down the debt was coming from Social Security, increasing the debt on Social Security, thereby savaging, not saving, the fund. But so it goes.

We do miss Senator Hruska. Mostly we miss his habits and his leadership and his balance in service. I think more than the balanced budget, what we need is balanced Senators.

With that, I yield the floor for a balanced Senator, the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Nebraska about the late Senator Roman Hruska. There is something unique about Nebraska. There has been a long line of outstanding Senators to represent that State on both sides of the aisle. I know my colleagues and I appreciate very much both of our Senators from Nebraska, and they have carried on the tradition of Senator Curtis and Senator Hruska for honesty and integrity and a forthright addressing of the issues.

I know Senator Hruska is proud of Senator HAGEL, as Senator HAGEL and the rest of us who had the privilege of knowing Senator Hruska appreciate him and his service for 22 years in the Senate—a very long time.

I agree with the comments of my old, dear friend from South Carolina that we do need more balance in the Senate. He and I occasionally find ourselves on different sides of an issue, as we do on this one. But our disagreements have been characterized with mutual respect and appreciation. And frankly, I enjoy the debates I have had over the years with the Senator from South Carolina because he marshals his audience, and not only that, he from time to time injects a degree of humor that illuminates as well as elevates the debate.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to former U.S. Senator Roman Hruska, who served Nebraska and our Nation with honor, dignity and ability for 22 years in the U.S. Senate, from 1954 to 1976.

I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of Roman Hruska. Roman was a man who embodied all the positive

traits of a good public servant. He was selfless, a man of integrity and character, and someone who was committed to helping others.

I had the pleasure of serving with Roman during his entire service in the U.S. Senate. He and I were both Members of the class of 1954.

It is my hope that others will be inspired by Roman's commitment to public service and helping others. He was a good man who will be missed by a large circle of friends in and out of the Senate.

#### ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of legislation introduced by Senator ROTH that would permanently protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The fate of the Arctic Refuge has been one of the highest profile natural resources issues of the past 20 years and will continue to be a key issue in the environmental debate. The Refuge is one of the last unspoiled wilderness areas in the United States, and is most often referred to as the "biological heart" of Alaska and "America's Serengeti."

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the only place in the United States where a full range of sub-arctic and arctic ecosystems are protected in one unbroken stretch of land. This 1.5 million acre coastal plain is home to a vast number of species including arctic foxes, musk oxen, wolves, polar and grizzly bears, wolverines, and more than 135 varieties of birds. The area is also the main calving ground for the 120,000 head porcupine caribou herd, which migrates each spring to feed on the vegetation found there.

In the summer of 1997, I traveled to the refuge and was able to see first hand how beautiful and important this land is to both Alaska and the Nation. As part of a Senate delegation, I visited the port of Valdez, where oil is loaded onto tankers, and I traveled along the pipeline that brings oil from the north. I also flew over the refuge itself, including the Mollie Beattie Wilderness. I was astounded by the natural beauty of this area that is home to such variety of plants and animals that rely on the delicate balance that exists in this pristine wilderness. I also visited a number of native communities along the North Slope and spoke to the inhabitants about their life in this unique environment that they depend on for both their cultural identity and their survival. As a nation we must continue to protect this vital ecosystem and work to bring good jobs, education, and health care to these native communities.

I continue to believe that the United States dependence on oil and its by-products cannot overshadow the importance of keeping ANWR free from the